

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet, 1 page

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-22 and 24-26 remain in the application. Claims 7, 14, 23 and 27-28 have been cancelled previously. Claims 1, 20 and 26 have been amended to state that the claimed construction is located on top of the pile-like device. As indicated by the Examiner, such an amendment distinguishes the claimed invention over U.S. 5,228,806 to De Medieros, Jr. et al.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner refers to claim 13 and states that the "spacers" and "connecting means" listed therein must be shown in the drawings.

The spacers of claim 13 are the same as the fins summarized in the specification and labeled as element 62 in Fig. 5. Please refer to paragraph [0028] of Applicant's substitute specification.

Fig. 5 has been amended to show connecting means 63 that are well known in the art, e.g. a simple weld.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Several claims have been objected to for grammatical issues. These claims have been amended and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the

claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 16-22 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by De Medieros, Jr. et al. (hereinafter De Medieros). As stated above, independent claims 1, 20, and 26 have been amended to include the feature of the construction being located on top of the pile-like device. This feature is not disclosed by De Medieros. Claims 2-6, 8, 10 and 16-19 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are also believed to be patentable over De Medieros. Claims 21-22 and 24-25 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 20 and are also believed to be patentable over De Medieros.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10, 16-22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros in view of U.S. 3, 851,483 to Holley (hereinafter Holley). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the invention is not taught or suggested. Further modification would be required.

Claims 9 and 13 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. As previously stated, claim 1 has been amended and De Medieros does not disclose the claimed location of the construction. The proposed combination also does not teach or suggest the claimed configuration of the pile-like device, junction piece and construction together.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 13 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros in view of Holley and further in view of U.S.2,080,406 to Allen (hereinafter Allen). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the invention is not taught or suggested. Further modification would be required.

Claims 11 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. As previously stated, claim 1 has been amended and De Medieros does not disclose the claimed location of the construction. The proposed combination also does not teach or suggest the claimed configuration of the pile-like device, junction piece and construction together.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Medieros. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Claim 15 depends directly from claim 1. As previously stated, claim 1 has been amended and De Medieros does not disclose or teach the claimed location of the construction. The proposed combination also does not teach or suggest the claimed configuration of the pile-like device, junction piece and construction.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application

is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. SCH-16446.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

By /James A. Balazs/
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700